

Interview with Chuck Kleinhans
conducted by Brian Winston
in Bozeman MT, 2016, and Eugene OR , 2018

BW: Tell us your tale.

Chuck: I grew up in the city of Chicago in a working-class neighborhood and then my family moved to the suburbs when I was in high school. I was really alienated from the high school environment and got relief by going into Chicago and seeing foreign films.

BW: Why did you go and see foreign films?

Chuck: They were more interesting, an alternative to the culture I had to live in as a dependent child. Luckily my folks always expected that from the time I was about six-years old, I'd use public transport to go anywhere in Chicago – that was just taken for granted. My first real interest in film, you know, was seeing things like the *Cranes Are Flying* and most of the neo-realist films with the arrival of European art films in the late 1950s in the United States.

Then I went to University of Wisconsin in 1960-64. A small film theatre in the student union made a practice of programming the latest films just released in New York. So I saw and was incredibly moved by films like John Cassavetes' *Shadows*, kinds of work by the realists, Lionel Rogosin, and revivals of classic works I hadn't seen earlier. Wisconsin had a terrific film society, one of the best in the country at the time, so you could fill in your film education that way.

But my main interest was in theatre and I was involved in an alternative theatre group which was sponsored by the religious society and campus groups, Mime and Man Theatre. We did the Theatre of the Absurd as it was just emerging, everything that couldn't be done in University theatre. So I was involved with all this alternative stuff.

BW: Were you involved as an actor or a director?

Chuck: Stage work. But because the plays were sponsored by a religious group they wanted an educational factor, so at the end of every performance we had a discussion between cast, crew, any of the audience that wanted to stay and a professor. That was my greatest interest. I remember that when we did a Camus play, Germaine Brée – the scholar from the French Department who knew Camus personally came — and talked with us about it. Mime and Man gathered this incredible loyalty of people who came regularly and stayed for discussion.  We were doing this eccentric thing in the Midwest, putting on Theatre of the Absurd, and at the same time we were building a very loyal audience. That shaped the way I thought media and theatre could be used.

I was also a photographer and photography editor of the year book. I'd been doing journalism and sports photography at high school and I was really used to being in an environment of taking images, moving fast and documenting things.

BW: Were you aware of a cultural hierarchy of film being at the bottom of the pecking order?

Chuck: Only faintly. My father had been raised as a Methodist so there was a family suspicion of mass entertainment. He always applied a formula that a film should be uplifting or something like that. I remember once having this discussion with him when I was in about 7th or 8th grade. I'd gone to see a double bill and one film was a mindless farcical comedy by a television comedian George Gobel, who played a dumb guy. I wanted to see it because I had seen his TV show then wanted to see his movie. The double bill had a Humphrey Bogart film, *The Harder They Fall*. I came back and said, "I didn't like that George Gobel film, but I liked the Humphrey Bogart one." My father, who loved Humphrey Bogart, said, "Yes, that's the difference – one is very depressing but you gained something from it, didn't you?" It was like some moral education, dealing with something profound.

BW: Was your background radical?

Chuck: Well, my family background was Taft Republican/Midwestern Republican, which was the norm. When I went off to college I lived in an

inexpensive rooming house with a bunch of New Yorkers, who included some former CP-oriented people. One was Gene Dennis, who was the son of Eugene Dennis Sr., who had been indicted under the Smith Act for being the head of the Communist Party in 1952, had been jailed for eight years and recently let out to die of cancer. When I met this guy, we were just playing football and running around and doing stuff together. I knew he had these really crazy, radical, left ideas but I didn't know the fact of who he was until someone from New York said that his father was the head of the Communist Party. I said, "No, I didn't know that!" [laughs]

At the same time, I had already signed up for Naval R.O.T.C.. After college, I went off to spend two years in active duty in the Navy. Going in three weeks before Tonkin Gulf, I was serving during the beginning of the Vietnam War. But even with that commitment, I incorporated this funny kind of skepticism. When I was in R.O.T.C., my social group were these New York Lefties. I would go to the military ball on a Saturday night after which there was always an anti-military ball on Sunday [laughs], and I would go to both!

I loved being in the Navy: driving ships around in the ocean is one of the greatest things in the world. The military as an institution is absolutely oppressive and stupid. It tolerates and promotes stupidity, so it was easy to be skeptical. It was also easy to be skeptical of the Vietnam War. In fact, if you were in the Navy all your training involved working with the model of counter-insurgency; you know, you work in the grassroots, you build up your local base. But, of course, the Vietnam War was run by the Army and Air Force who didn't know what the hell they were doing. They thought they could bomb peasants out of existence and commit other atrocities and win a conventional war. So, if you were in the Navy, you would be skeptical.

My work in the Navy also relates to my film career. I was assigned to a small destroyer that was mostly used for training purposes, so we only had half of a regular crew because we brought on these reservists and took them out for a week or weekend for their training and then brought them back. I was the most junior officer but had more power than any other junior officer would have at that stage because we were a training ship, so I was immediately elevated to the position of first lieutenant which means

you're in charge of the entire deck division. This normally would have taken two years to get to. I'm also the junior officer on board. The guy who was my senior officer – in terms of the watches that we were keeping – was a bachelor who loved movies and he wanted to see at least two or three movies a night.

In the Navy you get these Hollywood films, and the crew, the officers, and the non-commissioned officers watch them, so the same movie gets watched three times on three different projectors. Every time I had duty with this guy, I had to be the projectionist and I got used to showing two or three movies a night. I've seen every Beach Party movie ever made about five times; I saw every Western from the late 1950s and early 1960s at least ten times. I got this incredible education in mainstream films, just by watching these movies.

And I also got the greatest insight into ideology and mainstream film. It happened when we showed *Doctor Strangelove*. All the officers thought it was hilarious because it criticized the Air Force and they were such dummies, weren't they?! And I'm sitting there thinking, "Yes! Those Air Force guys are such assholes!" Wait a minute. Ideology, how does it work in films?! [laughs]

So, then I go back to grad school and I do theatre studies and literary theory, mostly from a French perspective because my main language was French. Again, I'm in comparative literature, so I'm doing theory and theatre and then decide to do my dissertation on farce in late nineteenth century France and England — a pretty unconventional topic at that time. I went to grad school with bad grades actually so I made A's the first year to show that I could do it. But I also almost immediately get involved in the underground newspaper. I joined the underground paper that fall; we were the voice of the anti-war student-reform left at the time in 1966 at Indiana University. Later Julia arrived in about 1970/71.

Because I got involved in the activist anti-war left as a veteran, I came at it from a slightly different position than the other parts of the anti-war movement. In the student reform movement, I was in a sort of postgraduate-style-SDS called New University Conference that faculty and

graduate students formed. As staff who were trying to forge a New Left approach to higher education, we had an incredible critique of that institution. I worked for NUC for years as an organizer and was sent as a project organizer to Michigan, so I was a paid underground outside agitator for a year in the middle of graduate school, which was a healthy thing to do.

Then I ran into Julia and she was all interested in film; I liked film, but I wasn't obsessed with it. I was already versed in the continental theory. Then when I go to Julia's dorm room, she says these are the books you need to know about film; read those six books and you're fine. Julia's going off to France to meet and interview Godard, unaware that he had just had a motorcycle accident and wasn't available to anyone. Our plan was to go to Paris, meet up with Godard and interview him about how Brecht had influenced him. I'm going as a tag-along and I'm writing my dissertation, by hand, in Paris at the time.

Julia says, "Oh, the *Cahiers du Cinema* editors are going to have this workshop at the Avignon theatre festival." And I hear "theatre festival" and it's like oh great! So, Avignon has a theatre festival, and I'm really eager to go since all the best groups from Europe are going to be there. During the daytime, which is dead time during a theatre festival, *Cahiers du Cinema* are having a workshop – this is just as they had become super Maoist. I'm happy to go to that because every afternoon they'll be showing another movie. The workshop showed films by Godard and Gorin in their Dziga Vertov period, very didactic, and also widescreen documentaries from Maoist China. So, we go to hear these supposedly most advanced Marxist and Leninist thinkers about film and it takes about half an hour to figure out what's wrong with them. It's conclusive by the time you get to lunch when these five of six guys who have been holding forth (I always thought *discuter* meant discuss, not proclaim the truth from their point of view) at about a quarter to noon when their girlfriends come in in their sundresses carrying their little bags from shopping that morning and they all go off to lunch; and in the afternoon there is going to be a movie. At that point, after going through this thing, I figure if these are supposed to be the smartest people in Marxist and Leninist film criticism and I can see what's wrong with them, then maybe I have something to contribute here. Then to cap it

all off, we went to the UK and the BFI summer workshop run by Sam Rhodie and Chris Williams in Sterling, Scotland. That clinched it. I had been sitting in Paris reading Althusser as well as having read Barthes, and I come in and these people depend on their secretary for translations.

BW: This is a continuation of the recording we began in August. But this time we are in Eugene, Oregon, on 20th February. So where did we get to? We'd got to 1979.

I know you'd misbehaved at a Sterling BFI Conference. I know that you weren't impressed with the "heavy" mob at all and I know that you went to all these various meetings which convinced you that you guys now felt you could contribute to film studies. We last left it where you were going to a Sterling meeting and you were going to see a film or program by Sam Rhodie.

Julia: I was visiting in London shortly before the first time I went to one of those BFI workshops. At the BFI in London, a group of the forthcoming workshop leaders were looking at *She Wore A Yellow Ribbon* to see how it related to the workshop topic of realism. I went to that black and white screening with them and said, "As I recall from my childhood that was a color film because she wore a yellow ribbon?!" [laughs] They didn't believe that.

Chuck: To get copyright protection Hollywood had to deposit a print with the BFI so they just sent over a black and white print and the BFI people just never figured it out!

Julia: I just told them that I recalled that it was in color; the point of the title was the soldiers' yellow bandana. They didn't believe me. Chuck wasn't with me then. When I came back, I told him the British film folks were taking these Hollywood films as a serious comment on life in the United States whereas we'd see them as satire and laugh at them because of how exaggerated they are.

Chuck: These films had a level of social criticism exactly the same as you would find in the Sunday supplement magazines in the 1950s or in the

journals and papers in columns like, “Can this marriage be saved?” It was the same sort of social criticism, you know, that goes on in educated middle-class circles of discussion. It’s like in *All that Heaven Allows* when Cary looks through the television set that her kids had given her and she sees her own reflection, and that gesture seems to mean something profound – like everyone already knew that. Sirk was recreating a well-known meme of the time. But in the UK, Sirk was seen as offering a startling criticism of the US and it seemed to the *Screen* folk that no one had realized this level of critique before.

Julia: So, the next year these articles came out looking at Sirk as Brechtian. I’d written my dissertation on Godard as Brechtian ...

Chuck: You hadn’t finished your dissertation by that point. You were writing it but the reason we’d gone to Europe that summer in 1971 was so that you could interview Godard.

Julia: Well, that was my experience at the first BFI summer school I went to. I did meet Angie Martin and she continues to be a great friend. She told me these really peculiar things about the UK. For example, Angie had an education degree and she didn’t think that was a real degree. I was totally shocked by that. In the US, that’s a respected degree. Angie told us the next year when both Chuck and I went to the BFI summer school, there’d been this rebellion at the BFI. The clerical staff were no longer going to do the typing for the men, so they’d have to do it themselves. This was a big victory. We got a glimpse of a different sort of intellectual life in the US and UK. Later, in *Jump Cut*, when we started to get some articles from some British film scholars, it felt like they knew nothing of footnotes. We would assign one of our collective to go and write up footnotes for many of those articles.

Chuck: UK intellectuals just assumed other intellectuals would know what important writers said. For example, Sam Rodie sent us this article. I wrote back to him about paragraph seven or eight saying he was just paraphrasing, or block-quoting without signaling authorship to the reader. But anyone who knew about the field would have known the unattributed

use of this material. He responded that these were just “ideas in the air”?! What a weird idea.

Julia: The US education system drew much of its ideas from the German system.

Chuck: I always thought it was the British pattern of the university education being based on these short essays. If you’re working with your tutor they know what you’re writing about so they didn’t need to know where you were looking. You learned it at high school, how to write papers. At graduate school in comparative literature, our program was dominated by these German scholars who were extremely, rigorously vigorous about that. My tutor would check every footnote and correct them. He checked about 220 footnotes himself! I saw him in the library doing it. But I knew he would keep me anchored.

BW: Cultural studies inflects film studies. Your reading of film studies, was it to take Hollywood seriously? That they didn’t know what they were doing?

Julia: They were serious about studying Hollywood. Parts of the whole cultural movement at the time that I wasn’t particularly fond of asserted ideas like the text constructs the subject, subjectivity is not cohesive, realism should be attacked, and Brecht was tied into postmodernism and a kind of avant-garde that was just a perpetual deconstruction. In fact, one part of the cinematic avant-garde was looking at the apparatus at that time. Another section was looking at the lyrical or the autobiographical. I always had an interest in documentary (which had been left out of the discussion). There were assertions of unbreachable dichotomies like the title of the magazine, *M/f*, with the slash representing the barrier between masculine and feminine. And I remember Raymond Bellour came through town in Evanston IL once and gave a lecture at Northwestern talking about *Rebecca*, saying that cinematic language was totally patriarchal. I said afterwards in the discussion, “Every revolution is created by a group of people who live in a hegemonic culture that is not their own, they speak the “master’s” language. Some of the things they make changes to are the

things they can imagine. Revolution always comes partly from the language of the masters."

BW: What about the quote about the master's tools can never break the masters house?

Julia: I think it's there. I think it creates some of the big tensions in major social movements. I certainly saw it in Nicaragua where some old structures and attitudes perversely remained. But I think that there's no place outside of the world – as if you could have a little pure place over here and from there you can go attack the masters.

BW: What year did you go down to Nicaragua?

Chuck: Julia went in about 1979/80. It was a year after the anniversary of the revolution – 1980/81. We went together to a language school in Estelí in 1984 and then worked teaching video with the labor union where we shot a lot of footage with them. We then went back and the first thing Julia showed them was the slideshow we made into a video. Then you [Julia] went back in 1987 to work with the Mint (Ministry of Interior) for a while.

BW: Chuck, let's go back to your work history. You said in Montana about how you got a job, Julia is already working at the University of Illinois in Chicago and you're driving a school bus for disabled kids?

Chuck: I had many jobs at the time. I was working for Citizens in Action, where we went door-to-door opposing the first big freeway that was going to be built through eight working-class neighborhoods. We organized against that and it was very successful. It was a community organizing project kind of like what Obama started.

But then I was also applying for teaching jobs and I got a job first at Chicago State. It is on the far south side of Chicago where 90% of the students are black and their families didn't go to college. But I had taught a course on African-American literature at Indiana, so there was some entrée

into teaching at State. Plus, I'd taught some intro to remedial writing. I got hired there as contingent faculty and learned a lot about teaching remedial writing so I had to reprogram myself to become a remedial writing scholar. With that, I managed to get into North Eastern which was a white, working-class and Latino university on the northwest side of Chicago. It's the neighborhood where I grew up, so it was very familiar to me. They had these storefronts where I would go and teach English as a second language. As the students would be learning English from me, they would simultaneously get their first two years of college in Spanish. So they could take history, biology in Spanish and finally get their skill level up in English so that they could then go on to the main campus. They had a 45% retention and graduation rate, which was phenomenal.

Meanwhile, we started *Jump Cut* and Paddy Whannel, who was at Northwestern, started to meet us more. Peter Wollen had this job there that was split between the English Department and Radio, Television and Film. Then English decided that they didn't want to do anything more with film and didn't really like Peter, so they cancelled out Peter's thing. It was a super snobby English Literature Department. RTF didn't have the money to replace his salary in film, didn't have enough to keep him. Laura Mulvey was simply a faculty wife and was treated as such by everyone. She was given no credit for any intellectual thought of her own. Yet she was the chair of the 1974 Chicago Women's Film Festival. Peter goes back to the UK where a job opens up at the University of East Anglia and he becomes one of the first film lecturers there. By that point, because Peter had been in RTF, all the graduate student realized they knew this stuff that none of the other faculty did.

BW: So, they had Paddy Whannel?

Chuck: Jack Ellis hired Paddy, who then brought over Peter and Laura. At the end of the summer that we were at the BFI in 1971, we had dinner with Peter and Laura in London to talk about the job that Peter was going to in the United States.

Julia: And I'm teaching at the University of Illinois in Chicago.

Chuck: They then fire Peter in 1975 and Jeffrey Nowell-Smith fills in for one disastrous semester. In the fall of 1976 the graduate students revolt and go out on strike. They had no power. They demanded that the department had to hire someone to replace Peter because no one else in the RTF faculty could teach anything about contemporary theory. They were “allowed” to TA and they demanded to get paid for grading papers. So, for about a week and a half the graduate students refused to go to class. Finally, the Dean panicked and gave the department some money to deal with this.

At that point Paddy, in classic Paddy style, asks Patricia to have a dinner at which I would be invited to with Julia. We go to Patricia’s house which is actually a penthouse apartment because her husband was one of the most successful corporate lawyers in Chicago. We go there and Patricia, who is still a graduate student, serves us some frozen lasagna meal. I don’t know exactly why I am there. At the end Paddy says, “Can we talk for a moment? Chuck, would you be interested in teaching a couple of courses for us?” I asked what he had in mind and he said the contemporary film theory course but I could also pick anything else I wanted. I had about four, five weeks to get my act together. I started in the spring and chose experimental film, which was another course that needed to be taught. Towards the end of that term, the department said I was very successful and that they would like to me to teach that next year for the whole year, 1977-78. That’s how I ended up in Northwestern and I was there for the rest of my career.

Julia: I was fired three times in four years for being a radical and then I was blacklisted for about twelve years. As a videomaker I travelled around and got some quarter or semester gigs and went to Nicaragua a few times. I had the fortune of being married and having a base income so with my unemployment checks, I would get a video camera and stuff like that. I learned video production in that space of time — I already knew film production.

When I got hired in Oregon it was mainly for film production. That was 1988-ish. In Chicago, there was a very nice independent film community. Everybody went to each others’ screenings and saw each other’s work. I

asked a few of my women videomaker friends how to do the technical part of it – they said I could just get on with it.

Chuck: There was a very strong video community in Chicago. I took my first class at The Center for New Television which was taught on Saturdays to teachers in the Chicago public school system who wanted to learn more about videomaking. You'd take five or six classes and learn how to make video – it would empower people in the community and was very progressive.

Julia: I learned about timecode and later sat in on a course at the Art Institute. We were just a very close-knit community. There were festivals across the country about women directors and women's film and video. Some very memorable work played that was never seen again. I was later asked to speak at a number of them.

Making media has strongly influenced my teaching and writing. I've always been a firm believer that people who write film criticism should do some form of media practice. If you can't understand the construction of sound and image, then you don't know what film or video is. I think that I've really appreciated learning from industry studies. My teaching and my own writing have always been focused on this is how it's put together.

BW: Chuck, did you have some problems as a desperate radical?

Chuck: They didn't trust me. It was a little odd in the sense that I came on the job market in 1972. The bottom had fallen out in hiring literature teachers at that point. When the first wave of the baby boomers arrived in the 1960s at the universities, all the state colleges expanded. Then there was actually a decline with not as many people going for higher education. In the meantime, the colleges had stacked up all these profs who would often get tenure without publications since the schools [at that time] just needed bodies to keep talking to students. So there was this gap.

When I finished my PhD was in the first years of this decline – very few people in the humanities were getting hired as there were only a few jobs. Julia got a tenure-track job because she was working in film; my

background was originally in 19th century theatre in France and England. I had no particular academic future at that point. When I first showed up at Chicago State I had a background in teaching African American students. And at Chicago State I got involved with a group of people who were excellent progressive teachers of remedial writing for disadvantaged students. I then transferred the same skills up to Northeastern Illinois and taught English as a second language. Then Paddy Whannel needed someone to fill in.

At Northwestern I took the job but I never expected to get tenure because I'm too leftist. It was a very conservative institution at the time; the president was a Chicago School economist. I just assumed tenure wasn't possible so I just did what I wanted. I thought I got this job for a little while and then I'd have to go and get another. For example, the department never let me teach the freshmen since I might contaminate them with Marxist ideas.

Actually, when I first started to teach the freshmen, I taught basic production. Ellen Seiter, who had just gotten her MFA, and Michelle Citron – the feminist filmmaker – and I redesigned the introduction to production curriculum, which was in a sorry state at the time. The department had split between broadcast (radio and TV) and film. Broadcast were the leftists and film the rightists, with Paddy running his own little cohort. Students complained bitterly about their production classes, so the Dean said "we gotta go fix it." Michelle arrived, who was an unknown quantity, and I had just arrived and I knew something about teaching introductory studies. The department let us have full control of the introductory production course and we redesigned it completely. We started teaching feminism from the ground up and stuff like this. Well, for the first two or three years, the other faculty didn't realize that their students were going to arrive in advanced classes asking, "How come there aren't any women directors listed in this class?" which drove them nuts. It took a while for them to catch on.

In the meantime, there were some very fierce struggles. What happened was that Ellen was hired for a year as a replacement for the main production teacher. He was your classic 6'5" male and a documentary filmmaker; the MFA program had just started then, too. And Ellen was the

one woman production teacher with six guys. The ethos was you could only be a filmmaker if you could carry a camera on your shoulder and run around. You know, the whole masculine ethos. When Michelle arrives and Ellen is in charge, suddenly there is a completely different atmosphere. Before, women students had always gone to the television side because students could learn television and understand it by being an understudy in each position. The camera assistant would put a newbie in and they would spend six months learning before that person graduated and so forth. You know, learning television production was accessible to women in a way that film wasn't. So, Michelle and Ellen start going off at lunchtime to the gym to lift weights together, and then suddenly you've got this whole cohort of women going with them to go to the gym to lift weights.

Then the boys start resenting this. As the women start making feminist style films, so the guys have this massive reaction, making films where women are raped and assaulted. Those films, of course, start causing problems, and then you have this environment where you have at the end of year screenings, women shouting and stamping their feet at how sexist some film is. Then the boys start crying [laughs], then there is reaction and resentment. Then you have the opposite reaction when the women start showing films that even slightly hint at feminism. It did turn into a horrible mess.

So around that time, and this is probably the most political thing we did, we said that for the following year we wouldn't accept work that had a lot of violence in it. Of course, we were accused of squelching free speech and freedom of expression. Then the faculty passed a resolution against things like this. But what we came back with, which I thought was very clever, was that actually we were upholding broadcast standards. You know, you can't actually show this on television, so why should we allow students to make this sort of film. It was great because a more conservative woman on the faculty accepted it because it made sense to her; it gave her a way of dealing with this situation.

So, I went on my merry way and I knew that I wouldn't get any form of promotion or commendation. I was totally surprised that I got tenure. I hadn't anticipated getting that. I was embarrassing the administration; I

was teaching things like pornography and showing avant-garde experimental films. I could never really teach documentaries because Jack Ellis always did, but I liked being the outsider or the bad boy. As a department, we were also downgraded because we were below the regular humanities – they had a very low regard for us – but you never really had to impress them. We did form alliances with the theatre department. Again, in Theater there was a group who were very much oriented toward practice with some critical theory, so I was always able to get along with those people.

BW: So when and how does *Jump Cut* start?

Chuck: We had all the tools because I was a journalist in high school and I'd done editing and I had worked in the underground press. In the last year that we were in Bloomington at Indiana University, which was 1972/73, John Hess and his then wife, Judith, became somewhat more radicalized and Judy got a job in northern California and Julia got a job in Chicago. They were both film people, and John was a film person too. I had never taken a film class but I got interested from hanging out with Julia and going to France to see the screenings over the summer. I realized I was smarter than most people and had much better politics, too. I can remember we were actually sitting having a coffee in the university library and saying, "We should start a film journal," because John published something in *Film Quarterly* and Julia and I had published something too. *Women and Film* had started and Julia had written for them and then they asked me so I submitted and was published there. We were engaged in writing film criticism locally and stuff like that. Then we had this casual conversation in which we said we want to publish our own stuff, we want a broader span than *Women and Film*, so we thought we should just do that. In a crazy way we decided that John and I had extra time because we didn't have full-time employment so we could just start a full magazine. We agreed about it in December when John came to Chicago for a meeting.

BW: But the way you just described it was that it was entirely in opposition. So, it wasn't limited to women and it wasn't anti-intellectual – so what was it? Did you write a paper like John Foster Kane, you know, on principles?

Chuck: The first editorial is that. We had posters that we put out first to try and get some articles. The first article was a statement essentially saying that we know you know what a jump cut is. Roger Ebert uses the term jump cut without explaining it in his newspaper columns. So, it was like, "You're interested enough in film to know what a jump cut is." That's a term that everyone knows.

BW: Was it a jump cut in terms of development?

Julia: Absolutely.

Chuck: It was kind of validating the classic Godardian jump cut. It doesn't have to be this long, smooth, elegant movie magazine. We're just going to get out there and say these things.

Julia: We sort of declared early on that we were left and feminist and that there were directors in Hollywood who were very interesting, I don't know what else we said.

BW: When was the first issue?

Chuck: The first issue came out in 1974. We formed the idea the previous spring; we started with it and solidified it in Christmas 1973.

BW: People make so much about when you gave a little talk to everybody at Visible Evidence in Toronto. The pair of you said, "Come on, imagine something, and get off your butt and just do it." But was it really quite hard?

Julia: No, it wasn't. Chuck insisted that first of all you take a little narrow column and you paste on it little sheets of ruled paper and take that to the printer.

Chuck: The whole thing was produced on this electric typewriter.

Julia: And Chuck will have to tell you about typing the first issue.

Chuck: No, you tell them.

Julia: It was very funny. Chuck insisted on typing and laying out the whole of the first issue himself. But he was a little frantic, and then the day we had to go to the printer, layout was not quite finished, so Chuck said to me: "Tell them to go fuck themselves!"

Chuck: I remember calling Julia up because we had a deadline for delivery and I called her at 10:30 a.m. totally frantic and desperate. And Julia said, "Calm down, calm down. I'll be home this afternoon. Don't worry!" I phoned the printer and arranged to bring in the material in a few days.

Chuck: We never justify the text but we did have a proportional Selectric typewriter spacing letters, so it became a little more elegant.

Julia: In any case we eventually got a typist, which was good. I just told the printer somebody was sick and it was going to take a couple more days.

BW: But it is amazing and this was out of your own money?

Julia: I think that's very interesting. For almost all of the life of *Jump Cut*, from beginning to end, we each put a thousand dollars into the printing – so about \$3000 between us. In other words, that was the cost of the printing and eventually the cost of the printing plus the envelopes and the mailing.

Chuck: We did the mailing by hand first, which was crazy.

Julia: There were little groups that took *Jump Cut* to bookstores.

Chuck: In Chicago there was a little film community and people knew about us. Part of it was that there were helpful people at Northwestern, including Russell Campbell. When we published the first issue, he invited me to come up to campus with an armload of the things. He said, "Oh, here is this new magazine and this guy Chuck." He introduced me to film theory

classes and suggested that people buy a copy of *Jump Cut*. I sold a couple of copies to students at film screenings there. People started asking when we were going to have another issue and that they would like to write something for it.

Then we started to have *Jump Cut* Collective meetings; people would come over to our place on Saturdays and that was fun. The same thing happened in Berkeley: John got divorced from his wife and moved down to Berkeley, which was a more interesting place to live. He was doing the same thing by selling *Jump Cut* at the Pacific Film Archive and meeting curious people there. They were then invited over on Saturdays to his house to help put out the next issue. So, it was like these people would arrive. We'd read and discuss things and people would decide if an essay was good or what they didn't like. Then after that they would smoke some dope and maybe go out or cook some food. In Berkeley there was this hot tub place that everyone went to where they would just sit around naked, soaking. It was a classic hippy enterprise.

BW: One of the characteristics of classic hippy enterprises is that they are no longer with us and you guys are all that is left.

Julia: We changed to not having collective meetings.

Chuck: I don't remember when they stopped. It must've been with people moving to different places. John and Julia and I always worked together collectively.

BW: Your agenda didn't change. You were still interested in new material and political context.

Julia: Here's an interesting fact. We couldn't afford a lot of phone calls so we have a huge amount of correspondence, especially between Chuck and John about manuscripts and *Jump Cut*. We want to get that put up at the Pacific Film Archives or the Academy of Motion Pictures because it's one of the only written records of a small magazine like this, precisely because it wasn't being handled by computers, it was being handled by personal letters. So we have that material. In fact, we thought of going to

an all-in electronic format earlier than we did. We surveyed all of our editorial board and people we thought were interested, but they all wanted a paper journal, not an electronic one. When we've finally went all electronic, what became clear relatively soon was that we could publish and add a lot of still pictures. Now the advantage is that we can publish 50 to 60 frame grabs per essay.

Chuck: Now people who have themselves grown up learning from very heavy use of frame grabs for their essays have set a model for people who can now publish their essays with these photographs. All the other publishers are scared shitless.